

REMARKS

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's indication that claims 1-10 are allowed and requests reconsideration of this application in view of the following remarks and accompanying amendments. Claims 1-18 were pending. Applicant amends claims 6, 8, 9, 11 and 12, cancels claim 15 without prejudice or disclaimer, and adds new claims 19-21 herein. As a result, claims 1-14 and 15-21 are pending in the instant application.

Claims 11-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yudasaka et al. (U.S. 2002/0179906) in view of Bojkov et al. (U.S. 5,947,783). With regard to claim 15, Applicant deems the rejection moot in view of Applicant's cancellation of claim 15 herein. With regard to claims 11-14 and 16-18, Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the reason that Yudasaka and Bojkov, both alone and in combination, fail to render obvious the features recited in independent claims 11 and 12 as amended herein. Support for the amendments to independent claims 11 and 12 may be found throughout Applicant's specification as filed, for example in paragraphs [0069] and [0070] of Applicant's Published Application. These amendments add no new matter.

For example, Yadasaka and Bojkov, both alone and in combination, fail to teach the feature,

forming a gate electrode comprising a chained metal body of nanoparticles over a substrate having an insulating surface;

recited in independent claim 11. Likewise, these references, both alone and in combination, fail to teach the feature,

forming a gate electrode and a connection wiring each comprising a chained metal body of nanoparticles over a substrate having an insulating surface;

recited in independent claim 12. Indeed, the Examiner explains that,

The applied prior art of record does not disclose the presently newly added limitations of independent claims 1 to 4, a LCD device including the a gate electrode comprising a chained metal body of nanoparticles over the one of the pair of substrates.

on page 3 of the Office Action mailed March 12, 2010. Applicant respectfully submits that because Yadasaka and Bojkov, taken alone or in combination, fail to fairly suggest or render obvious the features recited in independent claims 11 and 12, that only with the benefit of hindsight knowledge gleaned from Applicant's own disclosure, would a person of ordinary skill in the art be able to arrive at Applicant's claimed invention. For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and removal of the rejection of independent

claims 11 and 12, and claims 13-14, and 16-18 depending therefrom, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Applicant additionally amends claims 6, 8, and 9 herein to clarify aspects of the claimed invention. Applicant amends claim 6 to depend from any one of claims 1 to 4. Applicant amends claims 8 and 9 to represent exponents as superscripts in the range “ $1 \text{ cm}^2/\text{V}\cdot\text{sec}$ to $15 \text{ cm}^2/\text{V}\cdot\text{sec}$ ”. These amendments are formal in nature and add no new matter.

Further, Applicant adds new claims 19-21 herein to claim additional features of the present invention not taught by the prior art of record. New claim 19 depends from claim 11 and recites,

wherein the gate electrode comprising a chained metal body of nanoparticles is formed by discharging a composition containing conductive nanoparticles with a droplet discharge method and drying the composition containing conductive nanoparticles.

New claim 20 depends from claim 12 and recites,

wherein the gate electrode and the connection wiring each comprising a chained metal body of nanoparticles are formed by discharging a composition containing conductive nanoparticles with a droplet discharge method and drying the composition containing conductive nanoparticles.

New claim 21 depends from either claim 19 or 20 and recites,

wherein average particle size of the conductive nanoparticles is from 5 nm to 10 nm.

Support for new claims 19-21 may be found throughout the specification as filed, for example in paragraph [0069] of Applicant's Published Application. These claims add no new matter. Applicant respectfully requests allowance of new claims 19-21 at least by virtue of their dependence from allowable base claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If, however, the Examiner deems that any issue remains after considering this response, Applicant invites Examiner to contact the undersigned attorney/agent to expedite the prosecution and engage in a joint effort to work out a mutually satisfactory solution.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jeffrey L. Costellia; Reg. No. 35,483/

Jeffrey L. Costellia

Registration No. 35,483

Attorney for Applicant

NIXON PEABODY LLP

CUSTOMER NO.: 22204

Suite 900, 401 9th Street, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004-2128

(202) 585-8000